UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,656	03/01/2004	Chirag D. Dalal	VRT0126US	9561

60429   7590   04/22/2008
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER
LI, ZHUO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/7/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

        In response to applicant's argument that Young fail to teach or mention storage objects, it

is noted that the claimed language fails to specifically define storage objects such that any object

being stored in a memory can broadly read as storage object. Note Young clearly teaches a

computer system having a first object and a second object (col. 2 lines 3-13), wherein the system

stores the properties of an object in a property list (col. 1 lines 46-47). Thus, a person of ordinary

skill in the art would recognize the objects as taught by Young to be read as storage objects as

stated in claim 8. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations

from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, for at least the reasons that Young teaches or

mentions storage object and the rejection of claims 8-11 is maintained.

        In response to applicant's argument that the proposed modification would change the

principle of operation of Russell by requiring Russell's global object specification 160 to

comprise Russell's local object specification 150, it appears that Russell implicitly teaches to

copy all the object properties from each respective local object definition into a set of respective

global object properties in newly defined respective set of global object definitions (col. 14 lines

22-28), thereby the global object specification comprises object properties of the local object

specification. Note the claimed language fails to further limiting the component storage object of

the second storage object comprises all the property of the first storage object. Furthermore, the

claims merely define "the computer system choosing the first storage object to be the component

storage object due to the property of the first storage object". Since Russell does not specifically

teach the second storage object comprising a component storage object and the computer system

choosing the first storage object to be the component storage object due to the property of the

first storage object, the use of Bulusu is for teaching a method for manipulating a categorized

data set (read as second object) based upon an original data set (read as first object) such that the

categorized data set comprises category item (read as a component storage object) and a

computer system selecting the original data set to be the category item due to the property of the

original data set (col. 10 lines 31-67), thereby efficiently manipulating large categorized objects

in memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Russell in having the second storage object comprising a

component storage object and the computer system choosing the first storage object to be the

component storage object due to the property of the first storage object, as per teaching of

Bulusu, in order to efficiently manipulate large categorized objects in memory. Thus, the

proposed combination of Russell and Bulusu does not require a change in the principle of

operation of Russell for at least the reason as stated above since the use of Bulusu is for further

teaching the selecting step, which is not explicitly disclosed or taught by Russell. In fact, the

proposed combination of Russell and Bulusu teaches the claimed limitations as recited in claims

1, as well as independent claims 12, 19, 20 and 21. Therefore, the teaching of the references is

sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. As a result, one kill in the art would

articulate the combination of the references teaching the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1,

12, 19, 20 and 21 and their corresponding dependent claims.

Claims 6-7 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Russell, Bulusu, and Furuhashi. The rejection on the grounds of claims 6-7 and 17-18 are, respectively, dependent upon one of rejected base claims 1 and 12. Note applicant fails to provide any argument in the Remarks filed 4/7/2008. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

/Sanjiv Shah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2185